thalloid development in ferns than in the *Ophioglossaceae* and a difference in the evolution of the spores. He would, therefore, place the *Ophioglossaceae* in an order of equivalent value with the *Filices*, but in advance of them in a system of classification, inasmuch as they are in some respects more highly differentiated than the latter. —The *Library Journal* for November contains an article by Prof. Ezra Abbot, of Harvard University, showing to what extent many of our standard works of reference continue to perpetuate the old and erroneous view as to the papyrus (*Papyrus antiquorum.*) For instance in "Adam's Roman Antiquities" we read that this plant was "abut ten cubits high, *and had several coats or skins above one another, like an onion*, &c." In Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," under the article *Liber*, the writer says: "The *papyrus-tree* grows in swamps, &c.," and that "paper was prepared from the *thin coats or pellicles which surround the plant.*" Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon defines *βίβλος* as "the *inner bark* of the papyrus." A similar account is given in the Lexicon of Jacobitz and Seiler, Pape, and Rost and Palm's edition of Passow under *βίβλος* and *πάπυρος*; so also in many encyclopaedias. *e. g.*, the "Encyclopaedia Britannica," and others. This common error of speaking of the *papyrus* as if it were an exogenous plant (and even a *tree!*) has originated from ignorance or forgetfulness of the elements of botany, and the consequent misinterpretation of the passage in Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xiii. 11–13, al. 21–27), which is our chief source of information about the ancient manufacture of paper from this plant. One of the words Pliny uses to describe the thin strips into which the *cellular substance of the stem* was sliced in making the paper is *philyra*, which strictly denotes the inner bark of the Linden tree (*Tilia*), also used as a writing material. Hence the papyrus has been conceived of by the eminent authorities above cited as an exogen, with its inner and outer bark!

W. R. G.

§ 300. **Epigaea repens,** L.—I found specimens of this plant in full bloom at Princes Bay, S. I., on Saturday, Mch. 1st. I do not know that it has ever been found earlier in this locality.

A. H.

§ 301. **Anychia dichotoma,** Mchx., **not dichotomous.**—I do not know whether attention has already been called to the fact, that the specific name of this plant is really a misnomer, if we take the term, "dichotomy," in its strict scientific signification.

If we examine younger specimens of our Anychia, we invariably find every axis terminated by a *flower*, with a branch on each side from *lateral* buds *below* the apex. Hence this is a plain case of cymose, not of dichotomous ramification. In older specimens, say toward the end of July or in August, when many of these terminal flowers have fallen off, the main stem and many branches appear bifurcated. But I need not repeat that this cannot be called dichotomy, which only occurs when some axis, *at its very apex*, is "cut into two" branches, which may again be divided in the same manner, and so on.

Now, although I commonly agree with those who believe in the